



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Am*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,879	07/03/2001	Michael Antonin Sebcsta	ROC920000308US1	2204
47542	7590	04/05/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH, DEPT 917 ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			BURGE, LONDRA C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/898,879	SEBESTA, MICHAEL ANTONIN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Londra C Burge	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 12/09/2004.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending and claims 1, 12 and 19 are independent claims.
3. This action has been made Non-Final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mora et al. (herein after Mora) U.S. Patent No. 6,161,113 filed 1/20/1998 in view of Ertemalp U.S. Patent No. 5,745,110 filed 10/8/1997.**

*In regard to independent claim 1, Mora discloses providing a multiple level arrangement of documents with a first level document representing a task of a project and a second level of documents representing subtasks of the tasks, such that the documents are arranged in a hierarchical manner, and wherein said project may comprise multiple tasks (Mora Col 11 Lines 21-30 and Cols 25-58 i.e. all show descriptions or summaries and Fig 3 shows a hierarchical structure of the document); adding a summary information field to each document with relevant summary information for that document (Mora Col 17 Lines 39-44 Lines 60-64 and Col 59 Lines 21-24 and Col 17 Lines 16-20).*

Mora does not specifically disclose *said summary information including information about a percentage completion of a particular task/subtask represented by the particular document*. However, Ertetalp shows where a start and end time are set for a project and a table which displays the progress of the project according to the start and end time (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of displaying the progress of a project based on a start and end time set for the project to ensure the project remains on schedule for successful completion.

**In regard to dependent claim 2, which depends on claim 1,** Mora does not specifically disclose *further comprising determining whether said saved document as updated a value within its summary information field prior to completing said dynamically updating step*. However, Ertetalp mentions that project management software such as Microsoft Project include the step of automatically updating the project schedule if task information has been changed, updating it after each task change and before the next change (Ertetalp Col 1 Lines 20-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of updating changes made to the project so the user can keep track of the project to see the progress.

**In regard to dependent claim 3, which depends on claim 1,** Mora discloses *monitoring which documents among all opened documents within the hierarchical structure contains said summary information field, wherein said determining process is restricted to only those documents that contain a summary information field*. (Mora Col 11 Lines 21-30 and Cols 25-58 i.e. all show descriptions or summaries and Fig 3 shows a hierarchical structure of the document) (Mora Col 9 Lines 9-17 and Cols 25-58)

**In regard to dependent claim 4, which depends on claim 3,** Mora does not specifically disclose *assigning to each task and subtask within the project individual point total representing a completion point for the specific task and/or subtask; encoding said point total within the summary information filed of the document representing the specific task and subtask; enabling updates of a completed point total within the summary information field for each representative document of each task and subtask of the project; automatically determining a point total and completed point total for all tasks and subtasks affiliated with said project; and dynamically calculating a current completion percentage of said task utilizing a sum of the completed point total for subtasks associated with the particular task and dynamically calculating a current completion percentage of said project utilizing said point total for the project and a sum of said completed point total for each task within the project total.* However, Ertetalp shows where each task is assigned a time frame for completion and a chart is displayed which show the progress of each task with its completion assignment and how it correlates with the completion assignment assigned to other subtasks within the project. The chart also displays the progress of each subtask within the project (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 an 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of assigning each subtask within the project a timeframe for completion and correlating all of the different timeframes of each subtask together to ensure proper organization in completing the project.

**In regard to dependent claim 5, which depends on claim 4,** Mora does not specifically disclose *dynamically outputting said current completion percentage by displaying the completion percentage of a task at a particular level when the representative document within that level is*

*selected, wherein when the highest level document is selected, represented the entire project, the completion percentage of the project is displayed.* However, Ertetalp shows where each task is assigned a time frame for completion and a chart is displayed which show the progress of each task with its completion assignment and how it correlates with the completion assignment assigned to other subtasks within the project. The chart also displays the progress of each subtask within the project (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 an 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of assigning each subtask within the project a timeframe for completion and correlating all of the different timeframes of each subtask together to ensure proper organization in completing the project.

**In regard to dependent claim 6, which depends on claim 5,** Mora does not specifically disclose *where said project is subdivided into subproject level having associated tasks and said dynamically calculating steps included calculating said percentage complete at each of said subproject levels.* However, Ertetalp shows where each task is assigned a time frame for completion and a chart is displayed which show the progress of each task with its completion assignment and how it correlates with the completion assignment assigned to other subtasks within the project. The chart also displays the progress of each subtask within the project (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 an 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of assigning each subtask within the project a timeframe for completion and correlating all of the different timeframes of each subtask together to ensure proper organization in completing the project.

**In regard to dependent claim 7, which depends on claim 6,** Mora does not specifically disclose *wherein said project and said subprojects are represented by project documents linked*

*via a computer application, wherein said outputting step includes outputting said completed percentage in a summary display of said project.* However, Ertemalp shows where each task is assigned a time frame for completion and a chart is displayed which show the progress of each task with its completion assignment and how it correlates with the completion assignment assigned to other subtasks within the project. The chart also displays the progress of each subtask within the project (Ertemalp Figures 4, 10 an 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertemalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of assigning each subtask within the project a timeframe for completion and correlating all of the different timeframes of each subtask together to ensure proper organization in completing the project.

**In regard to dependent claim 8, which depends on claim 7,** Mora discloses *wherein said computer application is a Lotus Notes Project Tracking application and said calculating step includes programming a LotusScript Agent* (Mora Col 3 Lines 2-13 and Lines 30-51) *to update a point total in each document within a document hierarchy of said project and subprojects* (Mora Fig 3 shows a hierarchical structure of the document)

Mora does not specifically disclose *a percentage completion of a particular task/subtask represented by the particular document.* However, Ertemalp shows where a start and end time are set for a project and a table which displays the progress of the project according to the start and end time (Ertemalp Figures 4, 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertemalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of display the progress of a project based on a start and end time set for the project to ensure the project remains on schedule for successful completion.

**In regard to dependent claim 9, which depends on claim 8,** Mora does not specifically disclose *where said determining step includes prompting a user of said document for and input of said completed point total prior to saving said document.* However, Ertetalp shows where each task is assigned a time frame for completion and a chart is displayed which show the progress of each task with its completion assignment and how it correlates with the completion assignment assigned to other subtasks within the project. The chart also displays the progress of each subtask within the project (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 an 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of assigning each subtask within the project a timeframe for completion and correlating all of the different timeframes of each subtask together to ensure proper organization in completing the project.

**In regard to dependent claim 10,** Mora discloses *querying at least one lower level document* (Mora Figs 3-8 shows a hierarchical structure of the document with options of choosing projects at a lower level); *and calculating an updated summary information value at said higher-level document.* (Mora Col 17 Lines 39-44 Lines 60-64 and Col 59 Lines 21-24 and Col 17 Lines 16-20).

**In regard to dependent claim 11,** Mora discloses *transmitting a changed summary information value to a higher-level document; and calculating an updated summary information value at said higher-level document.* (Mora Col 17 Lines 39-44 Lines 60-64 and Col 59 Lines 21-24 and Col 17 Lines 16-20).

Art Unit: 2178

**In regard to independent claims 12 and 19,** claims 12 and 19 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claims 13 and 20,** claims 13 and 20 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 2 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claims 14 and 21,** claims 14 and 21 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 3 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claims 15 and 22,** claims 15 and 22 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 4 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claims 16 and 23,** claims 16 and 23 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 5 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claim 17, which depends on claim 16,** Mora discloses *wherein said computer application is a Lotus Notes Project Tracking application and said calculating means includes means for updating a point total in each document within a document hierarchy of said project and subprojects to reflect said percentage complete utilizing a LotusScript Agent.* (Mora Col 3 Lines 2-13 and Lines 30-51) (Mora Fig 3 shows a hierarchical structure of the document)

Art Unit: 2178

Mora does not specifically disclose *a percentage completion of a particular task/subtask represented by the particular document*. However, Ertetalp shows where a start and end time are set for a project and a table which displays the progress of the project according to the start and end time (Ertetalp Figures 4, 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertetalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of display the progress of a project based on a start and end time set for the project to ensure the project remains on schedule for successful completion.

**In regard to dependent claims 18 and 25,** claims 18 and 25 in addition to the following reflect similar subject matter claimed in claim 9 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

**In regard to dependent claim 24,** claim 24 in addition to the following reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 17 and are rejected along the same rationale. (Mora Col 5 Lines 61-62 and Col 59 Lines 21-24)

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments, filed 12/9/2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-25 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Mora and Ertetalp.

The applicant argued that the original rejection of Mora and Saito did not teach the limitation of the percentage completed of the project (Page 9 Para 5). The examiner agrees, However in the new grounds of rejection Ertetalp shows where a start and end time are set for a

Art Unit: 2178

project and a table which displays the progress of the project according to the start and end time (Ertemalp Figures 4, 10 and 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Ertemalp to Mora, providing Mora the benefit of display the progress of a project based on a start and end time set for the project to ensure the project remains on schedule for successful completion.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Londra C Burge whose telephone number is (571) 272-4122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LCB  
3/28/2005

*Londra B Paul*  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EX R